

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/274,771
Amendment filed March 31, 2005
Reply to OA dated December 15, 2004

REMARKS:

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, and 11-14 are currently being considered, of which claims 7 and 9 have been amended. No new claims have been added. Applicant believes that no new matter has been introduced.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, and 11-14 stand under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over USP 5,576,759 (**Kawamura**) in view of USP 5,806,072 (**Kuba**).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In the **Kawamura** reference, images picked up in the single image pickup mode are used to generate reduced image data for retrieval, while images picked up in the continuous image pickup mode are used to generate reduced image data for retrieval for each group, and thereby both of the reduced images obtained from the single image pickup mode and the continuous image pickup mode are not concurrently displayed on the same screen.

In contrast to the present invention, since the **Kawamura** reference does not include the singly picked up image reproduction mode and the continuously picked up image reproduction mode, one cannot distinguish the image picked up in the single image pickup mode from that picked

up in the continuous image pickup mode by the reduced image reproduced and displayed (four-screen multi).

The present invention solves the above-described problem of **Kawamura** by including at least two reproduction modes, that is, the singly picked up image reproduction mode and the continuously picked up image reproduction mode.

On the other hand, the **Kuba** reference is intended to solve (Fig. 21(B)) the problem (Fig. 21(A)) which occurs by concurrent display of reduced images corresponding to different kinds of images (singly and continuously picked up images) in a multi-display (display of arranged reduced images), and does not presume separate display of reduced images corresponding to different kinds of images. Therefore, we submit that the **Kuba** reference cannot be naturally combined with the **Kawamura** reference.

It would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time to have combined **Kuba** and **Kawamura** in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Kawamura and **Kuba**, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the following features of base claim 1: the “normally picked up image reproduction mode” and the “continuously picked up image reproduction mode”, in combination with the other claimed features.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/274,771
Amendment filed March 31, 2005
Reply to OA dated December 15, 2004

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 1 and 3-6 should be withdrawn.

Claim 9 has been rewritten in independent form to incorporate features set forth in claim 7, without a limitation relating to directories being in a same layer.

Kawamura and **Kuba**, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the following features of base claim 9, as amended: The “normally picked up image reproduction mode” and the “continuously picked up image reproduction mode”, in combination with the other claimed features.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 9 and 11-14 should be withdrawn.

Claim 7, as amended, sets forth “wherein the one of said directories and said another directory belong to a same layer”. These features are supported in the original disclosure. See, for example, p. 22, line 27 to p. 23, line 6, and Figs. 19 and 23. These features provide an advantageous effect, as discussed from p. 22, line 27 to p. 23, line 6. On the contrary, **Kawamura** and **Kuba**, alone or in combination, do not provide this advantageous effect.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/274,771
Amendment filed March 31, 2005
Reply to OA dated December 15, 2004

Kawamura and **Kuba**, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the following features of claim 7, as amended: “wherein the one of said directories and said another directory belong to a same layer”, in combination with the other claimed features.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, all claims being currently considered are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/274,771
Amendment filed March 31, 2005
Reply to OA dated December 15, 2004

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,
ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



Darren R. Crew
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 37,806

DRC/lif
Atty. Docket No. 990306
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosure: Petition for Extension of Time